



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,192	12/12/2000	Kazuhiko Tomita	1344.1051/JDH	4249

21171 7590 05/19/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

WINTER, JOHN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/734,192

Applicant(s)

TOMITA, KAZUHIKO

Examiner

John M Winter

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 14 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

Status

Claims 13,14 and 16 remain pending.

Claims 1-12 and 15 have been canceled.

Allowability Withdrawn

The previously indicated allowability of claims 13,14 and 16 is withdrawn upon further consideration.

Response to Arguments

The Applicant's arguments filed on February 23, 2004 have been fully considered but are not persuasive in view of newly discovered references Nummelin et al. (US Patent 6,038,164) and Srinivasan (US Patent 5,548,506)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nummelin et al (US Patent 6,308,164) in view of Abbruzzese et al., (US Patent No 5,557,515).

As per claim 13,

Nummelin et al ('164) discloses A method of electronically authorizing or repudiating an electronically processed task, comprising:

storing a plurality of elements with respect to the electronically processed task in a database subsequent to an electronic authorization or repudiation;(Column 7, lines 24-37)

referencing said plurality of elements of the electronically processed task for each electronically processed task and for each user requesting authorization (Figure 2)

Nummelin et al ('164) does not explicitly disclose "displaying said plurality elements of the electronically processed task for each electronically processed task and for each user requesting authorization" Abbruzzese et al ('515) discloses "displaying said plurality elements of the electronically processed task for each electronically processed task and for each user requesting authorization". (Figure 9A) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nummelin et al ('164) method with the Abbruzzese et al ('515) method in order to provide a user interface to the database.

Art Unit: 3621

As per claim 14,

Nummelin et al ('164) discloses the method as claimed in claim 13

Nummelin et al ('164) does not explicitly disclose "repudiation reasons are stored in the database when a repudiation is rendered" Abbruzzese et al ('515) discloses "repudiation reasons are stored in the database when a repudiation is rendered". (Figure 9A) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nummelin et al ('164) method with the Abbruzzese et al ('515) method in order to analyze the efficiency of task execution.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan (US Patent 5,548,506) in view of Nummelin et al (US Patent 6,308,164).

As per claim 13,

Srinivasan ('506) discloses a method of reviewing tasks, comprising;

comparing a current task for the person in charge of the tasks to he stored completed tasks for the person in charge of tasks. (Figure 9)

providing a reviewer for the current task the review information for similar completed tasks.(Figure 7)

Srinivasan ('506) does not explicitly disclose "storing review information with respect to reviews of completed tasks associated with a particular person in charge of tasks" Nummelin et al ('164) discloses "storing review information with respect to reviews of completed tasks associated with a particular person in charge of tasks". (Column 7, lines 24-37) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Srinivasan ('506) method with the Nummelin et al ('164) method in order to analyze the efficiency of task execution.

Conclusion

Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M Winter whose telephone number is (703) 305-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6, 1st Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P Trammell can be reached on (703)305-9768. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (763) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/734,192

Page 4

Art Unit: 3621

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

JMW

May 16, 2004



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600